DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 222 PS 017 823

AUTHOR Conklin, Nancy Faires; And Others
TITLE Early Childhood Programs and Policy in the Northwest and Hawaii: A Regional Depiction Study.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 89
CONTRACT 400-86-0006
NOTE 50p.; For related documents, see PS 017 824-825.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education; *Day Care; Disabilities; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Needs; *Educational Policy; Financial Support; Government Role; Kindergarten; Parent Education; *Preschool Education; Program Descriptions; Public Schools; *Regional Characteristics; School Age Day Care
IDENTIFIERS *Alaska; Early Intervention; Hawaii; Idaho; Montana; Oregon; Project Head Start; *United States (Northwest); Washington

ABSTRACT

Detailed are early childhood education and care services in six Pacific and Northwestern States: Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. Section I discusses the need for early childhood education and care in terms of the prevention of educational and social failure and the changing composition of the work force. Section II, which concerns federal, state, and local involvement, discusses the expanding public commitment to early childhood programs. Section III describes early childhood programs in the Northwest and Hawaii. These include kindergarten, Head Start and other public prekindergartens, child care and before- and after-school care, early intervention for the handicapped, and parent education. Section IV provides a summary. Appendices chart the programs by states in terms of legislation and regulation, eligibility, level of service, funding, and pending issues. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304222

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

PROGRAM REPORT

EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS AND POLICY IN THE NORTHWEST AND HAWAII:

A REGIONAL DEPICTION STUDY

Nancy Faires Conklin
Rex Hagans
Leslie Crohn

January 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Northwest Reg. Educ. Lab.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

Sponsored by OERI Office of Educational Research and Improvement U.S. Department of Education

PS 018823

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly, or in part, by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Department of Education, under Contract Number 400-86-0006. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

CONTENTS

I. The Need for Early Childhood Education and Care 1

Prevention of Educational and Social Failure
The Changing Composition of the Workforce

II. The Expanding Public Commitment to Early Childhood Programs 4

Federal Involvement
State Involvement
Local Involvement

III. Early Childhood Programs in the Northwest and Hawaii 7

Kindergarten
Head Start and Other Public Prekindergarten
Child Care and Before- and After-School Care
Handicapped Early Intervention
Parent Education

IV. Summary 15

References 17

Appendices 18

A. Kindergarten
B. Head Start
C. Other Public Prekindergarten
D. Child Care
E. Before- and After-School Care
F. Handicapped Early Intervention
G. Parent Education

I. THE NEED FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE

In the past several years, national attention to the needs of young children has mounted. On the one hand, the increasing numbers and social and economic costs of school dropouts and dysfunctional youth are driving a call for expanded early intervention with developmental services. On the other hand, the needs of working parents give great impetus to expansion of custodial services for the young. Local- and state-level interest is reflected in the plethora of initiatives for publicly-funded child care and early childhood education.

The strength of the early childhood movement derives from a unique convergence of economic and social factors, bringing a variety of state and national elements into coalition.

Prevention of Educational and Social Failure

Recent reports suggest there are as many as one million school dropouts and one million runaways annually. Youth crime, child and youth substance abuse, teen pregnancy, and young adult unemployment and unemployability are widely recognized as national crises. High school retention programs, even middle school prevention programs have proven expensive and insufficiently effective. Remediation is giving way to prevention as an educational strategy.

Longitudinal studies of federally-funded preschool for disadvantaged children indicate positive outcomes in economic, social, and educational terms. For example, one widely cited study (Berrueta-Clement et al., 1984) reports on young adults who attended a model Head Start program. The study found that preschool attendance effects during the school years included better academic and social preparation for first grade, fewer referrals to special education, fewer grade retentions, lower dropout rates, more positive attitudes toward school, and higher self-assessments of ability. Other studies such as those by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (Lally, et al., 1987) and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (Gotts, 1987) show similar positive effects from early intervention programs.

Most pursuasive to policy makers have been the findings on the social and economic benefits of participation in prekindergarten and family intervention programs. As young adults, children who received program services are found to have greater economic self-sufficency; that is, lower welfare participation rates, higher rates of employment, and higher-paying jobs. Preschool attendees are more likely to support not only themselves but other members of their families and to participate to

a greater degree in family, community, and religious activities. Preschool attendees report greater self-esteem and aspirations. Their rates of delinquency are lower, both in terms of instances of arrest and conviction and the seriousness of crimes committed. Participants are also passing on their higher aspirations to their own children, creating hope of breaking the "cycle of poverty."

Such research has led to widespread acceptance of the need for parent participation in early childhood education and to the recognition of the need for earliest-possible intervention with handicapped children.

These long-term benefits have captured the attention of policy makers concerned with equity of opportunity and with prevention of school dropout and youth alienation. Social reform groups have called for early education opportunities for all at-risk children, including minorities, the poor, children from dysfunctional families, and the handicapped.

The reports of positive, economically cost-beneficial, long-term outcomes of preschool have also had a powerful impact on groups representing business and industry, those concerned with crime prevention, and those seeking to decrease welfare expenditures. For example, one alliance of corporate CEOs (Committee for Economic Development, 1987), has called for publicly-funded early childhood education as an economically justifiable strategy for reorienting youth, especially poor and minority youth, toward productive participation in our national social and economic life.

It is important to note here that the research base on effects of early childhood programs is somewhat narrow. Most studies of Head Start are of model, not typical, programs. Many preschools do not provide the quality elements of these model programs. Further, most focus on poor Blacks. The findings may or may not be equally applicable to other populations. However, currently available research clearly suggests positive effects from preschool opportunities for disadvantaged populations.

The Changing Composition of the Workforce

Simultaneously, the changing demographics of the American workforce are exerting a strong influence on the national view toward care of young children. Statistics projecting women's participation in the workforce indicate the profound change that is taking place:

- Mothers of school-aged children: currently, 66 percent are in the workforce; by 1995, 80 percent will be employed.
- Mothers of preschool-aged children: currently, 60 percent are in the workforce; by 1995, 75 percent will be employed.
- Mothers of infants under one year of age: currently 50 percent are in the workforce, double the number employed in 1970.

Women are being drawn into the workforce both to meet the rising costs of maintaining an acceptable standard of living for their families and because the size of the available workforce pool is declining. The number of young people entering the workforce will be significantly smaller in the next fifteen years than in the past fifteen. Projections indicate that 80 percent of the new entrants into the workforce will be women, minorities, and immigrants. The percent of the workforce composed of native, white men will decline from 47 percent to just 15 percent.

Currently, lack of affordable child care inhibits women's working, since the average cost ($3,000 per child per year) cuts deeply into potential earnings from entry level and minimum wage jobs. For example, 35 percent of women now working part-time or seeking part-time work report they would work more hours if affordable child care were available. Child care costs are a particular hinderance to welfare mothers' workforce participation. Thirty-six percent of those mothers with incomes of less than $15,000 report they would work if affordable child care was available.

Much like the alliance forming behind early childhood programs that is based on the reports of positive effects of such opportunities, a broad coalition requesting public attention to the care and development needs of young children is forming around the needs of working parents. The lack of income mobility for welfare mothers is due, in considerable extent, to child care problems. On the average, a welfare mother of two can expect to spend 45 percent of her income on child care.

Others urge attention to the need of business and industry for a broader, better prepared workforce and favor workfare programs that would require expanded child care assistance at least as a transition from welfare dependence to employment. Some model child care assistance programs demonstrate considerable success in increasing employment and decreasing welfare dependence: the child care assistance programs in two states resulted in a 50 percent drop in welfare dependence of the mothers enabled to work.

Clearly, the value of early childhood programs has been validated and established on a variety of levels. The following section further discusses the expanding public commitment to early childhood programs. Following this discussion, the paper looks at the responses of six states in the Northwest and Pacific: Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

II. THE EXPANDING PUBLIC COMMITMENT TO EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

Research reporting on the long-term benefits of early educational intervention and the increased need for child care have spurred expansion of early childhood education and care programs in both the public and private sectors. While federal, state, and local agencies' participation in early childhood programs has burgeoned in the past few years, public support of programs promoting the welfare and development of young children is by no means a new phenomenon. In this section, these commitments are reviewed, commitments which constitute the base upon which the Northwest and Pacific states have built the programs to be outlined in the following section.

Federal Involvement

Federal support of young child programs is wide-ranging, including medical/nutritional assistance; direct intervention and assistance to abused, neglected, and disabled children; support for day care for poor children; and developmental education for disadvantaged preschoolers. Four federal early childhood education and care initiatives--Head Start, Chapter 1, handicapped early intervention, and child care assistance--are key underpinnings of programs in the NWREL region.

Head Start is widely cited as a highly successful, cost-beneficial educational program, leading to greater success in adult life for at-risk preschoolers. It provides developmental services to children, primarily three- and four-year-olds. At the federal level, however, it is a Department of Health and Human Services, not Department of Education, program. Most providers are community service agencies or proprietary groups. Prekindergarten initiatives in the states are modeled after Head Start, both in terms of participant eligibility and program objectives. These state-funded programs increase the percentage of disadvantaged preschoolers who are offered prekindergarten; however, combined state and federal funds can provide services for only a minority of such children.

Recognized as perhaps the most successful program for serving the educational needs of economically disadvantaged students, Chapter 1 has a rich history of examining impact and implementation questions, demonstrating positive effects on student behaviors. Unlike Head Start, it is administered by the Department of Education and is a school-based program. Chapter 1 funds have been widely applied to extend access to kindergarten for the disadvantaged and, in some NWREL states, have recently been used to provide funding for prekindergarten as well.

Handicapped children three years old and above have been recipients of federal assistance programs, including set-aside slots in Head Start. With federal incentive funds, states have been providing Early Intervention to developmentally delayed three- to five-year-olds, as well as special education services to school-aged children. New federal handicapped services legislation (PL 99-457) requires, in order to obtain federal matching funding, expansion of services beyond those now offered by most states, extending services downward in age to time of diagnosis of a handicapping condition. Federal dollars cannot meet the costs of Early Intervention. Additional funding is provided by NWREL states and much more state support will be required to provide services from birth on.

The Department of Human Services dispenses a variety of funds to states to provide support for child care for welfare recipients. While the specific funds used and the method of distribution of child care assistance varies from state to state, all NWREL states apply significant amounts of their federal social services monies to child care and all states supplement the federal programs with funds of their own.

Federal involvement in early childhood programs--both education and care--has been primarily directed toward alleviation of disadvantagement. Federal support for early childhood programs has not sufficed to deliver full service to the entire eligible population. Indeed, in some cases the federal monies have been more at the incentive level. States and localities have responded with additional dollars to extend federally-initiated programs.

State Involvement

States in the NWREL region are directly involved in providing funds for each of the types of programs cited as federal initiatives: prekindergarten programs and supplemental educational services for disadvantaged children, handicapped Early Intervention, and child care assistance. Education and human services departments administer these programs, with responsibilities varying somewhat from state to state.

A primary area of state-level initiative in early childhood education has been the devlopment and expansion of kindergarten. Now near-universally available, kindergarten has lowered the age at which a child begins school from six to five years. Currently, there is considerable impetus to provide kindergarten on a full-day basis, at least to disadvantaged children.

States also support a variety of other direct and indirect services necessary to delivery of early childhood programs, for example, child care giver and nanny training programs at community colleges, registration and regulation of child care providers, and child care resource and referral services. States have also taken the initiative in developing parent education programs.

Local Involvement

Local school districts and municipal governments have also exhibited support for early childhood education and care programs. These include school programs such as expanded hours for kindergarten, supplements to disadvantaged student services, and school-based prekindergartens and before- and after-school care, some paid for out of local millages. Many child care-related support services, such as resource and referral services, and some direct services, such as public employee cooperative child care centers, have also originated at the local level. Based on these demonstrations of widespread community support, some such services are now replicated by state agencies.

Early childhood education and care programs in the Northwest and Hawaii aptly illustrate the complexity of this web of services. The following section describes the range of programs offered by the states in the NWREL service region.

III. EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS IN THE NORTHWEST AND HAWAII

This section presents an outline of the status of early childhood programs in the six NWREL states: Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. It examines kindergarten, Head Start, other public prekindergarten programs, child care, before- and after-school care, handicapped early intervention, and parent education. Thus, early childhood programs reported here include the various forms of care and development offered for infants to five-year-olds and, additionally, care for children of elementary age, as well as the parents of these children. Primary focus of the descriptions is on public funding and the schools' role in these programs.

Each early childhood program has been considered with respect to:

Legislation/regulation: What is mandated by law and administrative policy? What is the history of programs? What state agencies have responsibility for initiation and oversight?

Eligibility: What is the targeted age group? Who may participate in programs as a recipient of public funding?

Level of service: What proportion of the potential participant population receives services? Is the availability of service equitably distributed? Who provides the services?

Funding: What is funded out of public monies including federal, state, and local dollars? Are specific populations differently subsidized?

Pending policy issues and proposals: What legislative or regulatory proposals may be expected to arise? What are the stances of key constituency groups? What local initiatives are under way which may serve as statewide models?

---

*Figures reported in the report and in the Appendices are for 1987, unless otherwise specified, with the exceptions of Chapter 1 data which are for 1986 and Alaska and Hawaii child care and prekindergarten data which are for 1988. Data are derived from a wide variety of published and unpublished state and federal
(continued on next page)

Appendices A-G display the detailed findings for each state in tabular form. Following is a summary of the findings for each type of service.*

Kindergarten

Key findings with respect to kindergarten in the region are:

> Legislation/regulation: Kindergarten is both optional for districts (Alaska, Idaho, Montana) and mandatory for districts (Hawaii, Washington, and in 1989, Oregon); kindergarten is administered through the departments of education; elementary certification is required of teachers.
>
> Eligibility: All five-year-olds, although the month a child may start varies.
>
> Level of service: Almost all five-year-olds attend; most programs are half-day.
>
> Funding: State-funded, with limited federal auxiliary disadvantaged fundings (for example, kindergarten-age Head Start) in most states at half the per-pupil rate (in Hawaii, if districts offer full-day kindergarten, they receive full-day funding); there are some locally funded or augmented programs.
>
> Pending issues: Make attendance mandatory; provide full-day services; adjust entry age; certify teachers for early childhood education or K-primary.

Most children in the NWREL region are in kindergarten. Although the majority are served only with partial-day programs, there is interest in extending the kindergarten day. Three states have made access to kindergarten mandatory (with district exemptions in one state); the trend is toward compulsory kindergarten attendance. It may be locally funded or, if state-funded, is provided for at half the per pupil funding rate in most states. Age of legal entry varies and may be subject to reconsideration in some states. Departments of education have state-level responsibility for kindergarten.

Kindergarten teachers in the region can be expected to have elementary, not early childhood, certification. Nationally, the trend is to require certification or special endorsement in early childhood or child development. Educational institutions in the region are not prepared to meet a significantly higher demand for early childhood teacher training.

(* continued) documents, national summary papers and scholarly reports, and from telephone interviews with key personnel in state agencies. Migrant and Indian programs which are administered directly out of the national Offices of Migrant Education and Indian Education are not yet reflected in the tables.

Head Start and Other Public Prekindergarten

Key findings with respect to Head Start and other public prekindergartens in the region are:

Legislation/regulation: The region's states are divided into three federal Head Start regions; few schools are Head Start providers; three states (Alaska, Oregon, Washington) have initiated state-funded prekindergarten programs (while in Idaho prekindergartners are prohibited from school facilities); staff certification and program licensing requirements are highly mixed; state supervisory responsibilities may lie with the education or human services agency.

Eligibility: Head Start serves economically disadvantaged three- to five-year-olds, with set-asides for Indian, migrant, handicapped, and nondisadvantaged children; state prekindergarten programs are for four-year-olds and follow Head Start eligibility guidelines or expand them to a wider definition of disadvantagement.

Level of service: Regionally, an estimated 20 percent of the Head Start-eligible children (14,500) are served through the federal program, with some state prekindergartens augmenting this up to an additional 15 percent of eligible four-year-olds; some three- and five-year-olds are served, in addition to Indian and migrant programs which serve very young children through kindergarten, as needed; most services are half-day, with the exceptions of full-day Indian and migrant programs.

Funding: Federal Head Start dollars total approximately $35,000,000; state programs total nearly $18,000,000; some local districts fund their own prekindergartens; there are also school-related fee-for-service programs.

Pending issues: Define disadvantaged; extend programs to enable all disadvantaged children to enroll; strengthen staff certification and program licensing requirements; clarify the reponsibilities of the various state agencies now involved in oversight; secure greater involvement of the schools.

A significant, but difficult to determine number of preschoolers are enrolled in a developmental education program. Most spaces provided in public preschools are for low-income or other at-risk children. Head Start may serve three- to five-year-olds (and Indian and migrant children from birth) and where kindergarten is not part of the school program, provides preprimary schooling. However, most of the 12,000 children in the region in the $33 million federally-funded Head Start programs are four-year-olds.

The widely-reported success of Head Start has inspired state-funded prekindergarten programs based on the Head Start model. Three NWREL states have undertaken such initiatives:

- Since 1983, Alaska has matched federal Head Start dollars ($2,700,000 in 1988) to provide additional spaces for three- to five-year-olds.

- Washington has been developing its Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) since 1984, increasing funding each year to $12,100,000 for the current biennium and providing spaces for 4,000 four-year-olds.

- For the current school year, Oregon authorized a small State Prekindergarten Program, funded at $1,067,189 for 1988-89; the program serves 350 four-year-olds.

Expansion of prekindergarten to, at least, all at-risk four-year-olds is recommended by educational and other constituency groups throughout the region.

Most prekindergartens are provided by agencies other than the local schools. Head Start and the state programs modeled on it are contracted out on a competitive basis. In urban centers, schools play a role as Head Start providers; however, elsewhere few are direct providers. Schools offering prekindergarten may operate on a fee-for-service basis, often with sliding fee scale, but some local districts have operating levies for prekindergarten. State general education funds are not allocated for prekindergarten. In Idaho, children below kindergarten age are excluded from the schools; thus, schools in Idaho are ineligible to function as preschool sites.

As a federal program, Head Start is contracted directly out of regional offices. (The NWREL states are distributed in three regions.) State department of education responsibilities for other prekindergarten programs vary. In Alaska and Oregon, the prekindergarten programs are administered by departments of education. In Washington, the Department of Community Development oversees ECEAP.

Child Care and Before- and After-School Care

Key findings with respect to child care and before- and after-school care in the region are:

Legislation/regulation: Staff certification and program licensing requirements vary widely and are unstable; recent legislation has granted greater leeway for in-home program development and for in-school fee-for-service programs in most states; federal care assistance programs are human service- not education-administered; each state has some schools that are providing extended day programs.

Eligibility: Center-based child care minimum age ranges from birth to two years; funded assistance programs designate a maximum age ranging from 8-12 years; funded assistance programs are for low income parents working or in school.

Level of service: Perhaps two-thirds of those in child care are in private, unlicensed home care; there are approximately 170,000 licensed spaces in the region, meeting between 20 and 50 percent of the need for licensed center and home care; extended day schooling meets approximately 12 percent of the need for latchkey child care.

Funding: Federal assistance, primarily through Title XX Social Service Block Grants, is supplemented by state assistance; there are local programs on fee-for-service and publicly-assisted sliding scales; state tax credits or deductions are permitted in four states (Oregon also permits employer tax credits); state and municipal model employer provider programs are growing.

Pending issues: Make schools providers of, or locations for, child care, especially for school-aged children; allow use of school facilities by other providers; expand direct assistance by states to low-income parents and indirect assistance to middle-income parents; strengthen and standardize staff certification and program licensing; identify and regulate private care; resolve regulatory and oversight responsibility issues.

All studies of the workforce indicate that fewer children have in-home adult supervision and that this situation will become more acute as the labor pool shrinks. Provision of quality, affordable child care is a concern nationwide. Care for infants to five-year-olds, especially infants and toddlers, is overwhelmingly private and proprietary. Most parents seek family home care for very young children, although slots in center care are more readily available. Estimates indicate that most young children are in the care of relatives or other unlicensed individuals. While the schools do not play a leading role in preschooler child care, they are facing increasing demands to operate, or open their facilities for use by care centers for "latchkey children" during before- and after-school hours (also known as extended-day schooling).

Questions relating to child care for preschool- and school-aged children cannot be easily separated, even though it is the latter age group that is more widely regarded as the responsibility of the schools. "School-age" itself is being redefined as the age of entering kindergarten is reassessed, prekindergartens expand, and early intervention for handicapped children is extended downward to infancy.

For parents, a single agency and location for all their children is highly desirable and schools are a trustworthy agency. Smaller communities look to their schools as among the few suitable facilities for child care centers; urban neighborhoods look to their schools to become safe community centers for children. Schools with kindergartens,

prekindergartens and facilities for very young handicapped children inevitably suggest themselves as before- or after-school care centers. In any event, schools can expect to be asked to broaden their services beyond classroom education and beyond the hours of the school day. Such use of schools, including collection of fees, has been legally enabled in most states in the NWREL service region. Idaho specifically forbids the presence of preschoolers in school facilities, although fee-for-service collection is permitted for school-aged programs.

Responsibility for regulating nonschool-based child care lies outside education in most respects. However, the line between educational and noneducational early childhood programs is unclear at best. Thus, the domain of education's responsibility is difficult to determine. For example, in Alaska, a program that is "educational" must be certified by the Department of Education whose standards are very different from those of Health and Social Services which licenses child care homes and centers. Strengthening as well as standardizing licensing and certification requirements is a trend in all NWREL states. School-sponsored programs are generally not subject to state licensing, but inconsistencies in law are arising which will require that this exemption be re-examined.

Child care assistance is provided to low income and other at-risk children by grants from federal and state funds. The Title XX Social Service Block Grant is the primary source of federal support nationally. However, three of the NWREL states designate that state resources support child care assistance. There is widespread concern that child care subsidies do not suffice to meet costs.

Across the region there have been a variety of legislative initiatives to support and facilitate child care. These range from zoning waivers for family care homes to training grants for care providers, support for child care centers for state employees, tax deduction and employer tax credits, and increased direct assistance to low income parents working or in school. Standards for staff training and credentialing can be expected to rise; sufficient training programs are not yet in place to meet such a demand.

Handicapped Early Intervention

Key findings with respect to early intervention for the handicapped child in the region are:

> Legislation/regulation: States have or are considering plans for PL 99-457 compliance; state agency oversight is usually education for three- to five-year-olds and a human services agency for birth to three-year-olds; handicapped children in Head Start are also outside education agency oversight.

Eligibility: Currently, three- to five-year-olds, but by 1991 from age of diagnosis of disability for states adopting PL 99-457; specific definitions of the population under development by the states; mental, physical and emotional handicap are included.

Level of service: Current service for three- to five-year-olds ranges from all eligible to only the most severely handicapped; Head Start and state prekindergartens set aside slots for handicapped; rural children are relatively underserved; few schools can yet offer birth-through-two programs.

Funding: Federal funds provide from 9 to 70 percent of the dollars expended; some states have fee-for-service programs.

Pending issues: Provide for actual costs of PL 99-457 compliance out of state funds; define the eligible population for handicapped early intervention services; clarify the role of the schools, especially with birth through two-year-olds; clarify state agency oversight responsibilities and maximize use of state expertise in program regulation.

PL 99-457, requiring comprehensive intervention from infancy for developmentally delayed and disabled children by 1991 for receipt of federal funding, will necessitate vastly expanded services in the NWREL region. States must develop definitions of eligibility. Current law does not require that schools serve children under three. Nor does it prohibit fee-for-service arrangements, widely used in some of the region's states. Most NWREL states treat the most severely handicapped; this service will have to be broadened to children identified as mildly handicapped or delayed, as well as extended downward in age. Washington and Alaska estimate that they are currently providing service to all eligible three- to five-year-olds.

Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington have adopted 99-457 and are working under federal planning grants to prepare for its implementation. Montana adopted 99-457 with the proviso that it is operative only if half the required monies come in federal grants.

Agency responsibility for handicapped early intervention is complex, reflecting the variety of services that must be brought to bear in a comprehensive program. Education is only one of a number of state agencies directly involved in oversight, charged under PL 99-457 with program responsibility for three- to five-year-olds, but not infants through two-year-olds. PL 99-457 requires a state interagency coordinating council with decision responsibility; these groups are working currently to define the eligible population. This interagency council is being differently constructed in the NWREL states, with education in the lead role in some states, but not in others.

An additional concern among handicapped education specialists is that many intervention providers are not fully under any state supervision. Head Start reserves 10 percent of its spaces for handicapped and operates essentially independent of state special education personnel. Such

providers may take a more clinical approach rather than the developmental approach advocated by the schools. Thus, handicapped preschoolers may be coming to kindergarten or first grade with preparations different from other children.

Parent Education

Key findings with respect to parent education in the region are:

> Legislation/regulation: Federal and state child care assistance and early childhood education programs require parental involvement components; two states (Oregon and Washington) have initiated programs directed to educational needs of parents of children at risk.
>
> Eligibility: Low income or other disadvantagement of children; teen parents; in two states, programs for parents lacking basic skills.
>
> Level of service: Estimated 7,500 through Head Start parenting skills programs and 2,500 in state parenting and basic skills programs; perhaps 25 percent of those defined as eligible are served in such programs.
>
> Funding: Generally a component of other program funding.
>
> Pending Issues: Provide in-school programs for teen parents, with on-site child care; expand to enable all eligible disadvantaged to enroll; provide basic skills, as well as parenting education, through all programs; require school or college enrollment for participation in assistance programs; involve schools and community colleges to a greater extent.

Education of parents both in parenting skills and in basic and employment skills is increasingly cited as a key element in breaking the cycle of poverty. Teen parents are a special concern. Programs for young children such as Head Start and state prekindergartens have parent education and parent involvement components.

Washington and Oregon have recently initiated programs that are primarily, rather than secondarily, focused on parents. Washington's Even Start provides adult basic education and family support services to low-income parents at 13 community college and community agency sites. Oregon's Together for Children, while a smaller program, casts a wider "at-risk" net, including, for example, all single-parent and dual-employment families in its definition.

IV. SUMMARY

The report details early childhood education and care services in each state: kindergarten, prekindergarten, child care for preschool-aged and elementary-aged children, handicapped early intervention, and parent education. Each of the six states in the NWREL region--Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington--presents a different early childhood service picture.

The public role is reviewed for each type of service, including key aspects of legislation and regulation; populations eligible for publicly-funded services and the levels of service provided; levels of federal, state, and local funding for each service; and policy issues now pending in the states. Particular attention is paid to the role of the schools in providing services such as school-aged child care and prekindergarten.

Key findings of this regional depiction of early childhood programs include:

- Kindergarten attendance is near-universal and increasingly mandatory, but largely still available on a half-day basis only. There is interest in providing full-day kindergarten, especially for at-risk youngsters.

- Federally-funded Head Start enrolls only a minority of eligible at-risk children and state-funded prekindergarten initiatives do not suffice to meet the need. Most prekindergarten slots go to four-year-olds.

- Significant, but insufficient amounts are spent on child care assistance to low-income families. Increasingly, welfare eligibility is tied to placement of children in subsidized child care so that the parent can work or study.

- The states are developing responses to the federal requirement for downward expansion of handicapped intervention to age of diagnosis. There is widespread concern about the costs of this service to the states and districts.

- Parent education programs are developing, including teen parent programs which enable youth to complete high school, parenting training, parent involvement components of early childhood programs, and basic skills education for undereducated parents.

- State school agencies tend to oversee kindergarten, handicapped services to three- to five-year-olds, and some state-funded prekindergartens. Most other programs are outside the perview of the education agency, or, at most, are a shared responsibility with other agencies.

- Certification of staff is a major concern throughout the region, including early childhood specialization for kindergarten teachers and some standard for certification for prekindergarten, preschool and child care workers. There is also concern that increased preschool staff certification requirements will lead to higher costs for services, should low salaries rise commensurate with such requirements.

- Standards for child care and regulation of child care are still under development, with the demand for slots exceeding supply in many areas. Some schools are opening their facilities for use by child care providers, especially for the care of school-aged latchkey children.

REFERENCES

Berrueta-Clement, J.R., et al. (1984). Changed Lives: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths through Age 19. Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, no. 8. Ypsilanti, MI: The High/Scope Press.

Committee for Economic Development. (1987). Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged. New York, NY: Committee for Economic Development.

Gotts, E. (1989). HOPE, Preschool to Graduation: Contributions to Parents and School/Family Relations, Theory and Practice. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Lally, R., et al. (1987). Long-Range Impact of an Early Intervention with Low-Income Children and Their Families. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: KINDERGARTEN

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Alaska	o Option of local district o State agency: DOE o Elementary certificate o No maximum class size o Tests for speech, hearing & health o K & preK.2% of Chapter 1 children	o 5 years by August 15 o Pass screening	o All districts; 2,602 enrolled in full-day K o 472 K & preK get Chapter 1	o General fund dollars for K; half-count if half-day & full-count if full-day	o Make program mandatory o ECE certification o First language instruction, local hires o Class size maximums at 1:20, as for primary o Accommodation of private Ks if K is mandatory o Language development issues
Hawaii	o Provided since 1943; optional for parents o State agency: DOE o Elementary certificate o Class size maximum of 26, going to 20 in 1988-89 o Tests in all areas of development; screening in K through Early Provision for School Success program o No Chapter 1 K	o 5 years by December 1	o Almost all children served (98%) o All full-day o LEP pull-outs	o Class reduction special appropriations for 1988-89 for staff and facilities, $5 million o Special funding since 1982 for Early Provision for School Success o Staff development fund for K-3 o Full-day supplemental funds 1988	o LEP intervention a priority
Idaho	o Option of local district; younger children excluded from schools o State agency: DOE o K-grade 8 certificate o Maximum class of 25 for DOE accreditation o 2.5 hours/day minimum o Screening or tests not required o Private Ks unregulated o Ks are 3% of Chapter 1 children	o 5 years before October 16 until 1990; changes to September 16 in 1990, August 16 in 1991	o Most districts except very smallest; 17,354 enrolled, up 400 from prior year o Half or alternate days o Chapter 1: 505 served 1985-86	o State and local funding may be used for up to half-day K o Costs vary widely	o Full year half-day o Appropriate curriculum
Montana	o Option of local district o State agency: DOE o Screening required for K and grade 1 o Recommended class size of 20 for K-3 o Elementary certificate o Ks are 1% of Chapter 1 children	o Age not specified, but conventionally 5 years by September 10 o Pass screening	o 98% enrolled; all counties, but not all districts; 12,720 enrolled o 128 K get Chapter 1	o Use of state general education funds at district discretion	o Make mandatory in large districts

KINDERGARTEN, con't.

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Oregon	o Required by 1989, with hardship district exemptions o State agency: DOE o Elementary certificate o Recommend class size of 20 o Screening recommended o Ks are 3% of Chapter 1 children	o 5 years by September 1	o 41,961 eligible; 30,699 or 73% enrolled; 86% of age eligible have access o Half-day, except some large districts; full-day (1,061); some rural alternate day o 1,253 K get Chapter 1	o Funded at half district's rate/child	o All-day K o Curriculum and textbook adoption o Testing o Teacher certification
Washington	o Required o State Agency: OSPI o Elementary certificate o Screening local option o Ks are 16% of Chapter 1 children	o 5 years by midnight August 31 or pass early entry screen offered at district discretion	o All 5-year-olds enrolled o Most half day or alternate day o 4,040 K get Chapter 1	o Funded at half district's rate/child	o Planning for K-3 certificate, but training not available o Model all-day Ks in larger districts

APPENDIX B: HEAD START

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Alaska	o Federal HHS program, matched to supplement service delivery costs o Federally contracted o State agency: Dept. Community and Regional Affairs	o Federally defined as 80% poverty family, 10% handicapped, 3-5s	o Serves 4s and, where no K, 5s o 2,400 served in cities & rural (800 federal & 1,600 state); 40% served o No school district providers	o Federal funds $2,293,024 ($2,866/child) o State funds half match of federal to reach small communities $1,146,512 o Total cost/child $4,067	o Funding of additional slots by state up to all eligible 3-5s o Model Head Start/child care integrated programs in Anchorage
Hawaii	o Federal HHS program o Federally contracted; state match	o Federally defined as 80% poverty family, 10% handicapped, 3-5s	o Mostly 4s served o 1,137 served o Est. 20% served, mostly urban o No school district providers	o Federal funds $4,150,648 o States 20% match $830,130	
Idaho	o Federal HHS program o Federally contracted; state match o Migrant & Indian oversight federally	o Federally defined as 80% poverty family, 10% handicapped, 3-5s o Federal migrant & Indian set asides, 0-5s	o 1,166 served o Primarily 4s, most in rural areas o Est. 20% served o 1 school district provider o Migrant 411 served o Indian 269 served	o Federal funds $3,042,289 ($2,609/child) o State 20% match $608,458 o Migrant - $1,224,000 o Indian - $89,373	
Montana	o Federal HHS program o Federally contracted; state match o Migrant & Indian oversight federally	o Federally defined as 80% poverty family, 10% handicapped, 3-5s o Federal migrant & Indian set asides, 0-5s	o Serves 4s & 5s o 1,177 served, urban & rural Est. 20% served o No school districts as providers, but counties o Indian 1,068 served	o Federal funds $2,744,000 o State 20% match $548,800 o Indian - $2,827,837	
Oregon	o Federal HHS program o Federally contracted; state match o Migrant & Indian oversight federally o State CSD funds migrant slots	o Federally defined as 80% poverty family, 10% handicapped, 3-5s o Federal migrant & Indian set asides, 0-5s	o Serves mostly 4s, but some 5s where no K o 2,952 served (about 20%) o 1 school district as provider (Portland); 3 colleges o Migrant 1,325 served in 14 programs plus 4,675 through state CSD funds o Indian 247 served	o Federal funds $8,764,954 ($2,969/child) o State 20% match $1,752,991 o Migrant approximately $700,000 o Indian $119,772	
Washington	o Federal HHS program o Federally contracted; state match o Migrant & Indian oversight federally	o Federally defined as 80% poverty family, 10% handicapped, 3-5s o Federal migrant & Indian set asides, 0-5s	o Serves mostly 4s o 4,419 served (about 20%) o 15 school districts/ ESDs as providers (Seattle, Tacoma); 4 colleges o Migrant 1,336 served o Indian 570 served	o Federal funds $12,775,466 ($3,143/child) o State 20% match $4,219,034 o Migrant - $2,901,021 o Indian - approximately $1,486,593	

APPENDIX C: OTHER PUBLIC PREKINDERGARTEN

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Alaska	o State match of federal Head Start funding since 1983 o State agency: DOE for 3-5s preKs with state or federal funds o Recommend Child Develp. Associate/CDA widely held o DOE certification of educational young child programs, few standards set for staff, etc. o PreK/K .5% Chapter 1 children	o Federally defined as for Head Start, 80% poverty family, 10% handicapped, 3-5s	o 2,605 served from state matching Head Start in 1988 o Programs in 60 sites o Rural districts have 3 or 3-4 in-school preK (122 sites) o 472 preK/K get Chapter 1 o 1/3 of certified ECE programs located in schools	o $2,700,000 direct state match for Head Start program extension, 1 of 3 programs in state to get increase for 1988 o Rural districts provide own preK, if not Head Start or state-matched Head Start o Chapter 1, Indian Ed, Johnson O'Malley, special ed funding in district preK programs	o State should fund slots for all Head Start-eligible 3-5s o Model Head Start/child care integrated programs in Anchorage o Direct assistance to small districts for in-school preK o Coordinate state oversight for PreK, child care, etc. o Reconcile licensing & certification o ECE staff certification o ECE/CDA programs under expansion in colleges
Hawaii	o No state-sponsored preK o In-school preKs run by Kamehameha o No Chapter 1 preK (1985)	o Kamehameha: 4s	o Kamehameha: 4 schools with many Hawaiians	o No state funding	o Interest increasing
Idaho	o None known to DOE; children under 5 years excluded from schools o No state role o No Chapter 1 preK				
Montana	o Local district option o No state role o No Chapter 1 preK	o Age of kindergarten not set, but most preKs are 4 until October 15	o 96 children across 56 counties	o Local funds only, in many cases fee-for-service	

OTHER PUBLIC PREKINDERGARTEN, con't.

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Oregon	o State Prekindergarten Program authorized 1987 o SPP state agency: DOE o SPP contracted by DOE on a competitive basis to any nonsectarian agency or group capable of meeting program requirements o SPP adult:child ratio, regulations, content, etc. minimally as Head Start o SPP geographic equity o PreK .1% Chapter 1 children	o Follows Head Start, i.e. federal poverty family, 80% + 10% handicapped o 3-4s only	o About 350 slots (est. 3% of those not served) o 79 preK get Chapter 1	o $1,067,189 for biennium for SPP o Some local districts fund preK, especially Portland	o SPP evaluation funding being sought o Renewal and expansion of SPP expected as request o PreK for all at-risk 4s widely advocated o Schools & DOE leadership in early child programs widely advocated o Portland schools serve 1,700 preK from local funds, mostly low income
Washington	o Early Childhood Education Assistance Program authorized 1984 o ECEAP state agency: Dept. Comm. Development o ECEAP contracted by DCD to schools and Head Start-eligible providers, private + public nonprofit, and local government agencies o ECEAP lead teacher has AA in ECE/BA in ECE/CD + experience o ECEAP Adult:child, ratio 1:6 o ECEAP priority to high % at-risk in district o School districts also have locally-funded in-school preKs, many prior to ECEAP o PreK .5% Chapter 1 children	o Follows Head Start, i.e., federal poverty family, 90% + 10% children over income who could benefit o 4s only o 10% of slots for migrant and Indian	o ECEAP 4,000 served during biennium by 20 contractors at 13 sites (30% served) o With locally-funded programs, 0- to 70%, varying by county o Most programs half-day, but also full-day & home-based o 856 preK get Chapter 1	o $12,900,000 for biennium o Statewide average $2,800/child o School district-funded preKs mostly fee-for-service with some subsidy for low income	o PreK for all at-risk 3-5s widely advocated o Aligning locally-initiated and funded preKs o Rise in credentialing could not be met by existing trainers o Greater involvement of schools widely advocated

APPENDIX D: CHILD CARE

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Alaska	o Mix of providers o 0-3s, 3-5s and over 5s differently regulated o Six state regulators: DCRA: Day Care Assist., Head Start, Ed. & Training Grant, Dependent Care Grant, Child Care Grant, DOE: education program certification, DHSS: homes & centers licensing, D. Env. Consery., D. Public Safety, D.Law o Day Care Assistance since 1976, first in USA o State Training and Education Grants for providers o State Child Care Grant Program for providers o Licensing fee is for media training library	o CC assistance: low/ moderate income at work/ school	o Est. 36,000 slots, 8,571 in 186 centers & 2,700 in homes o CC assistance in 37 communities on sliding fee scale o Anchorage has 332 home slots, est. 12% of need	o Federal Title XX/SSBG not used for CC assistance o State CC assistance to low income $7,687,775 (defined as 3 persons at less than $23,700 or $31,164 rural) o $100,000 CC provider training & ed. grants, 1987 o $600,000 grants to CC providers for program facilities upgrade, fee subsidies, 1987	o Expand DC Assist. to more spaces, locales, hours o Coordinate state oversight of preK, child care, etc. o Reinstate Child Care Facilities Loan Program o Tax credit suspended until 1993 o Increase CC Grant/child o Address CC worker wages o Seek NAEYC accrediting o Increase use of public facilities e.g., schools o Develop model employer plan & state model it o Business CC tax credit o State Resource & Referral network o Latchkey programs
Hawaii	o State agency: Department of Human Services o 2-year-olds minimum for center care o Require license centers (13+), registration of homes (2+ nonrelated) o Staff training set for all levels; teachers 2 years college with specified CD content o Special programs in D. Health and DOE o Staff: student ratio age 2 -- 1:8; age 3 -- 1:12; age 4 -- 1:16; age 5+ -- 1:20	o CC asistance: 3 persons with income less than $10,100, protective, developmentally delayed	o 26,619 slots in 620 licensed centers & 947 slots in 192 homes o 900 children served with CC assistance o Demo centers with infants under special license	o $2,000,000 total CC in 1988 o DOE $124,000 to community agency for training of providers, parents; also $60,000 direct from state to agency for resource & referral system upgrade o Tax deduction for CC costs: residents only, regulated by adjusted gross income; nonrefundable; total claimed in 1986 - $4,200,000	o Lower minimum age for center care o Maintain staff training standards, despite lack of workers o Statewide resource & referral system o City/County Honolulu and Univ. Hawaii model employee CC centers o Seeking zoning waiver for CC homes
Idaho	o State agency: D. Health & Welfare o Licensing since 1987 for centers of 8+ children; optional for homes o All ages -- 1:12 for centers	o CC assistance: low income & at work/school	o 13,121 slots in 645 licensed centers; 379 slots in 118 licensed homes	o Subsidized renovation of facilities for 40 state employees' children o State income tax deduction at 100% of federal rate o State Work Incentive Program's CC assistance $59,012 FY87, federal Title XX/SSBG funds used only as supplemental	o Strengthen requirements for CC licensing, e.g., differing standards by age of child

CHILD CARE, con't.

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Montana	o State agency: D. Social & Rehabilitation Services o Licensing of centers with site inspection; registration of homes o Zoning permit waiver for homes, 1987 o Centers: max 13+/minimum age 2 years; infant center max 4, minimum age 6 weeks o Homes: max 6, max 3 for under 2s o Group homes: max 2:12, max 6 under 2s	o CC assistance: low income & at work/school	o 4,900 slots in 149 licensed centers; 2,000+ slots in 699 registered homes o Est. 62% of AFDC under 8s receive CC assistance o Est. 50% of all under 9s need some CC services	o State income tax deduction at 100% of federal rate to max. of $4,800 o State $280,700 FY87 CC assistance to low income at work/school o State $200,000 FY87 to assistance to those losing AFDC eligibility, sliding scale o Federal Title XX/SSBG not used for CC assistance	o State fund resource & referral service o Create business tax credit o Public employers model CC provision o Lift CC tax deduction limit
Oregon	o State agency: D. Human Resources for licensing o Licensing of centers (12+), registration of homes o Zoning permit waiver for homes 1987 o Parental leave minimum of 6 weeks to meet minimum age for CC o Children's Services Div. grants for CC assistance to parents in GED precollege programs	o CC assistance: low income & at work/school o CSD program grants to any CC-providing GED or precollege program o 0-8s get assistance	o 26,544 slots in 510 licensed centers; 3,026 slots in 9,078 registered homes o 4,477 CC assisted FY87	o State $5,682,000 FY88 CC assistance to low income at work/school o Federal Title XX/SSBG not used for CC assistance o $100,000 FY87 for resource & referral at state and local R&R matching grants o State employees eligible for CC reimbursement or paid salary deduction o State income tax credit at 40% of federal rate; total $10,370,000 in 1986 o 50% employer tax credit o Supplemental CC grants to parents in GED, precollege o $50,000 Dependent Child Block Grant includes R&R clearinghouse o Migrant CC assistance $1,523,000, state & federal for biennium	o Strengthen certification of CC homes o Expand low income CC assistance in level of subsidy & slots o Staff training requirements of, e.g., CDA o Increased employer support, e.g., in R&R o Greater involvement of schools o Community colleges preparing for demand with new CDA and nanny programs o Coordinate state ECP regulation, with some recommending DOE as lead agency

CHILD CARE, con't.

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Washington	o State agency: D. Social & Health Services, for licensing, CC assistance; OSPI gives CC for high school parents, Even Start o State Coordinating Committee has been set up will seek CC funding o In-school programs exempt from licensing	o DSHS CC assistance: low income at work/school, abuse/neglect family, Opportunity (WIN) participant o OSPI CC assistance: high school student, Even Start participant o 0-8s get assistance	o 13,000 slots in 600 licensed centers; 30,000 slots in 6,000 homes -- on the decline though most needed o Est. 450 slots in in-school teen parent centers o DSHS CC assistance for est. 2,400, half 3-5s and quarter over 6s o Seattle est. 40% of 22,000 get CC; 15% needing assistance are receiving it	o DSHS CC assistance over $16,000,000 ($50,000+ Indian reservation, $3,000,000+ migrant) o DSHS therapeutic care $2,000,000 o OSPI CC assistance in Even Start, voc. ed high school centers o Cost of Family Independ. Program CC assistance not yet ascertained	o FIP undertaking CC availability survey & demand for further subsidy strong, e.g., higher subsidy in costly urban areas o Employer support, tax credit o State resource & referral under study o Urge state staff training requirements, but programs not in place to meet demand o FIP would require CC provider contracts & licensing, not required of schools in past o DSHS recommend shift of CC assistance to local agency oversight, all teens assisted, higher subsidies o Greater schools' role urged o Public employers should model CC provision

APPENDIX E: BEFORE- AND AFTER-SCHOOL CARE

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Alaska	o State agency: DOE for Community Schools Division Assistance program o Fee-for-service basis in-school care permitted	o Proprietary: open o Students of the district in some urban district schools	o Schools get DOE Community School TA and other support for school-age CC o 2 school-operated programs funded locally	o Fee-for-service, but districts may provide space, utilities, etc.	o Restore full funding to Community School Program o Space and facilities o Program quality o Expansion of technical assistance
Hawaii	o State agency: DOE for school uses; DHS for CC regulation o Dependent Care Grant to DOE for in-school program suport o Local schools provide at principal's discretion	o Proprietary: open o In-school: students of the school o CC assistance: to age 12	o 194 in-school before- or after-school CC in 1985 o DOE provides TA, seeks support for resource & referral	o Local schools fee-for-service, use CC assistance o DOE $50,000 grant from federal Dependent Care with state partial match to provide for TA	o Expand to other schools, but principal can decide to permit or not
Idaho	o No in-school school-age care programs known to DOE; under 5s excluded from schools o State agency: DHW for CC assistance	o Proprietary: open o DHW CC assistance: low income at work/school, 5-8s		o DHW for school age/in-school programs not separate from CC assistance	o Use of school facilities for school-age care urged, especially in small communities that lack other suitable sites
Montana	o In-school care programs operated by private providers o State agency: DSRS for CC assistance	o Proprietary: open o DSRS CC assistance: low income at work/school, 5-8s o In-school programs 5-12s	o 250-350 after-school programs in 7 Helena schools	o DSRS for school-aged/in-school programs not separate from CC assistance	o Greater use of school facilities urged, for school-age and younger
Oregon	o In-school programs at local option o State agency: DOE has monitoring authority o 1987 DOE latchkey care need survey o Fee collection & use of school facilities authorized, teacher credential waived	o Proprietary: open o DCS CC assistance: low income at school/work, o In-school care, 3-5s	o 2,500 slots in 80 schools in 18 districts, esp. urban o 800 K-grade 6 in private schools & 2,700 over 4s in homes & centers o 12% of those needing latchkey care served; low-income underserved	o In-school programs fee-for-service, most with sliding income scale; fees average $80/month o CC assistance may be applied to any licensed or school prog o State-funded need survey 1987 o $50,000 Dependent Child Block Grant includes TA from DOE on school-age care	o Expanded use of school facilities widely advocated o DOE has study group for latchkey issues o Funding for extended school day urged o 65 programs in Portland schools, most parent-co-op and provider-run o Possible resubmit of bill to fund grants for school district programs

BEFORE- AND AFTER-SCHOOL CARE, con't.

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Washington	o Schools authorized to contract for services at fee, sliding scale, 1987 o State agency: OSPI for in-school programs; DSHS & OSPI for CC assistance o Federal Dependent Care funds used for latchkey start-up, mostly in schools, DSHS with OSPI assistance	o Proprietary: open o DSHS CC assistance: low income at school/work, abuse/neglect family, Opportunity participant, school-aged children o OSPI CC assistance: Even Start, high school students' children	o Some schools offer their own, separate from state programs o Assistance to 7 schools in 1988 for program start-up; plan 40 grants in 1989	o CC assistance may be applied to any licensed or school program, but FIP may affect this o Dependent Care Grants of $6,000-8,000 to 7 districts; plan $80,000 for 1989	o FIP would require CC provider contracts & licensing for schools o Great need perceived, but not measured o Greater use of school facilities widely urged and school involvement overall

APPENDIX F: HANDICAPPED EARLY INTERVENTION

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Alaska	o PL 99-457 adopted for 1991 o Interagency Committee on Early Childhood to expand beyond 1982 members (Health & Social Services, Education, Community & Regional Affairs) to coordinate with others, including Governor's Council on Handicapped & Gifted Parents o State agency: DOE for 3-5s, DHSS for 0-2s via contracts to community agencies	o Now serving 3-5s out of DOE o DHSS Infant Learning Programs take 0-2s	o 945 public school 3-5s 1988 plus 547 in state-supported schools o Also Chapter 1 and Head Start do handicapped o 3-5 funds part of regular state foundation dollars to districts o 0-2 funds special, annual appropriation o Expect all eligible 3-5s served, but some areas lack 0-2 services o 2 schools have 0-2 Infant Learning Centers	o For all handicapped, 70% federal, 7-8% state, 12-13% local o Many local districts raise supplements to state dollars o DHSS funds Infant Learning Program o Overall funds estimated $70,000,000	o Eligibility regulations being debated o Proper diagnosis, when handicapped category is the only way to ECE programming
Hawaii	o PL 99-457 adopted for 1991 o Interagency council led by Department of Health is planning, defining eligibility o State agency: DOE for 3-5s, DH for 0-2s o DOE Early Provision for School Success gives intensive screening at kindergarten	o Use learning impaired designation rather than specific diagnosis o Now serving 3-5s	o DOE serves 611 o D. Health has Infant Stimulation Centers, some direct service support grants o Full screening of Ks through EPSS	o Overall funds est. $2,000,000	o Definition of eligibility
Idaho	o Federal PL 99-457 adopted for 1991 o Under 5s excluded from schools, so compliance a legal issue o State agency: DOE for 3-5s; DHW for 0-2; DHW funds Child Development Centers o Exceptional child endorsement required o Head Start includes 10% handicapped	o 3-5s delayed development or handicapped under 99-142, but designated for most severe by state	o Most severe selected but based on type of handicap, where staff/facilities limited o Est. 1,500 served in special programs o Some kindergartens have service o Rural largely unserved o 2 districts added in 1987 o Est. 100 served in Head Start	o 91% of funds are state & local o $180,000 in 1987 o 30% children on sliding fee scales	o Reimbursement of costs not permitted under 99-457, so estimated increase of at least $500,000 in state costs for compliance o In-school 3-5 programs are impermissible, but some are in place

HANDICAPPED EARLY INTERVENTION, con't.

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Montana	o PL 99-457 will be law in 1991, if minimum of half required funds appropriated federally, otherwise retain 99-142 o State agency: DOE o Head Start includes 10% handicapped	o Under 99-142, 3-5s testing impaired	o 1,420 served 1987 o Cities all served, but rural unserved o Est. 100 served in Head Start	o State $402,256 in grants to districts o Rate of $254/child with 1 in 3 districts receiving supplemental $145/child for special costs	o Is DOE qualified to monitor 0-2s needs o High costs of 99-457 compliance, especially rural o Suitability of in-school care of severe 0-2s questioned by schools
Oregon	o PL 99-457 adopted for 1991 o State agency: DOE for vision/hearing; D. Mental Health for orthopedic & mental o 99-457 compliance plan underway led by DMH o 80 federal enhancement grants to schools 1988 in transition to 99-457 o State Prekindergarten Program includes 10% handicapped o Head Start includes 10% handicapped	o Under 99-142, delayed/ handicapped 3-5s; by 1991 0-2s under 99-457	o 2,200 served in 1987 (including 300+ DOE, 300 Head Start, 1,400 DHW) o 50% eligible served; preference for severe o State Prekindergarten 10% handicapped, est. 35 additional o Enhancement grants for facilities, etc., but will add slots	o $2,000,000 in 80 federally funded enhancement grants, including $500,000 for 0-2	o Costs of 99-457 compliance a concern to state & school districts o Feasibility of in-school care of severe 0-2s questioned by schools o Rural underservice
Washington	o PL 99-457 adopted for 1991 o State agency: OSPI and DSHS 3-5; Birth to 6 Project with DSHS as lead, including OSPI, D. Commty. Develp., D. Services for Blind o Probable agency: DSHS for 0-2s o OSPI coordinates with DCD for 3-5s	o Under 99-142 delayed/ impaired 3-5s; by 1991 0-2s under 99-457	o 4% of all 3-5s served, est. all eligible	o $36,000,000 federal & state services provided by OSPI o $1,140,000 from DSHS for coordination of federal Part H, 1987-88 o $880,000 99-457 planning grant from feds for federal Part H, 1987-88	o Costs of 99-457 compliance o Private preschools provide service, but lack OSPI/DSHS specialists' oversight o Definition of 0-2 population o Personnel training/ recruitment and retention for 0-2s, 3-5s o Coordination across OSPI and DSHS

APPENDIX G: PARENT EDUCATION

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Alaska	o Infant Learning Program has parent ed for at-risk/special need 0-2 parents	o Head Start: federally defined low income, 3-5s	o Head Start, federal & state, est. 1,200 o Parent ed in Infant Learning Program for handicapped o District preKs have strong parent component o Community schools may offer parent ed	o Component part of other programs	o Comprehensive parent support & training, with at-risk priority o Culturally-appropriate family support o Resource and referral services
Hawaii	o DOE provides parent component in K as part of EPSS, but decreasing o Department of Health: Parent Information Line, Parent Education Program o DOE Parent-Community Networking Centers, most in-school	o Head Start: federally defined low income, 3-5s o EPSS: low language skill o P-C Comm. Networking Center: K-12 student	o Head Start est. 800 o K parents o 34 schools have P-Comm. Networking Centers; will expand further	o Component of other programs o P-Comm. Networking Centers facilities & staff from DOE special appropriation	o Trying P-Community Networking approach to bring school & commty. into TA-type relation, rather than specific aid o Under EPSS reallocation of funds to class size reduction, teacher aides' parent ed role lost
Idaho	o No public programs, except in Head Start federally mandated component o No state role	o Head Start: federally defined low income, 3-5s	o Head Start: est. 800		
Montana	o No public programs, except in Head Start federally mandated component o No state role	o Head Start: federally defined low income, 3-5s	o Head Start: est. 800		
Oregon	o Together for Children, authorized 1987 o State agency: DOE for TFC o Recommend training in ECE/CD for TFC staff o TFC must coordinate with schools, child services o Head Start federally mandated component	o TFC: at-risk of failure by grade 3, from: low income, single/teen/ working parents, ESL, mobility, disruptive environment, delayed/ handicapped, minority, 0-8s o Head Start: federally defined low income, 3-5s	o TFC: 3+ programs o Head Start est. 2,000	o TFC: $267,000 for 1988-89	o Expand parent education for at-risk, especially teen parents o Teen parent programs in local schools, e.g., Portland, also local human service agencies o Training for parent educators not set o Which agency should lead

PARENT EDUCATION, con't.

	Legislation/Regulation	Eligibility	Level of Service	Funding	Pending Issues
Washington	o Even Start: programs to assist with parenting, basic skills, GED, precollege o Family Independence Program has teen mother component o State agency: OSPI for Even Start; DSHS for FIP o OSPI support for parents completing high school o Head Start federally mandated component o Some schools have teen parent programs o Some handicapped 0-2, 3-5 have some parenting components	o Even Start: below 8th grade level in literacy and/or one or more basic skills, Head Start/ECEAP-eligible, preschool & school-age o FIP: low income o Head Start: federally defined low income, 3-5s	o Even Start: est. 1,200 at 23 sites (comm. colleges and vocational/technical institutes, community-based organizations) o Head Start: est. 3,000 o 41 local programs in schools/communities for teens, est. 1,000	o Even Start: $1,600,000 for biennium o Technical assistance by OSPI to schools with parent programs o Optional service included in standard special ed funding	o Even Start for all at-risk parents o School completion programs for all teens o Expand parent ed within preK and CC o Coordinate state ECE & parent support programs o Greater schools' involvement in parent programming

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Robert R. Rath, Executive Director
Ethel Simon-McWilliams, Associate Director

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) is an independent, nonprofit research and development institution established in 1966 to assist education, government, community agencies, business and labor in improving quality and equality in educational programs and processes by:

- Developing and disseminating effective educational products and procedures
- Conducting research on educational needs and problems
- Providing technical assistance in educational problem solving
- Evaluating effectiveness of educational programs and projects
- Providing training in educational planning, management, evaluation and instruction
- Serving as an information resource on effective educational programs and processes including networking among educational agencies, institutions and individuals in the region

Center for Advancement of Pacific Education
John Kofel, Director
Center for National Origin, Race, and Sex Equity
Ethel Simon-McWilliams, Director
Education and Work
Larry McClure, Director
Evaluation and Assessment
Gary Estes, Director

Literacy, Language and Communication
Stephen Reder, Director
Planning and Service Coordination
Rex Hagans, Director
R&D for Indian Education
Joe Coburn, Director
School Improvement
Bob Blum, Director
Technology
Don Holznagel, Director

Western Center for Drug-Free School and Communities
Judith A. Johnson, Director

Institutional Development and Communications
Jerry Kirkpatrick, Director
Finance and Administrative Services
Joe Jones, Director

Board of Directors

Nancy Keenan
Montana Superintendent of Public Instruction

C.J. Baehr
Manager, Hawaii Interactive Television System

Charles Bailey
Education Director
Washington State Labor Council AFL/CIO

Robert D. Barr
Dean, OSU/WOSC School of Education
Oregon State University

Barbara Bell
Attorney
Great Falls, Montana

Jacob Block (Secretary-Treasurer)
Superintendent
Missoula Elementary District (Montana)

Raina J. Bohanek
Teacher
Coeur d'Alene School District (Idaho)

Judith Billings
Washington Superintendent of Public Instruction

Catalino Cantero
Assistant to the Secretary for Education
Federated States of Micronesia

William Demmert
Alaska Commissioner of Education

Jean M. Dobashi
Teacher
Kauai High/Intermediate School (Hawaii)

Verne A. Duncan
Oregon Superintendent of Public Instruction

Jerry L. Evans
Idaho Superintendent of Public Instruction

Earl Ferguson
Superintendent
Klamath Falls Union High School District (Oregon)

Joseph Haggerty
Principal
Blanchet High School
Seattle, Washington

James E. Harris
Beaverton School Board (Oregon)

Richard L. Hart
Dean, College of Education
Boise State University (Idaho)

Marlys Henderson
Teacher
Fairbanks School District (Alaska)

Jerry Jacobson
Superintendent
Idaho Falls School District (Idaho)

Homer Kearns
Superintendent
Salem-Keizer School District (Oregon)

Spike Jorgensen
Superintendent
Alaska Gateway School District

John Kohl
Dean, College of Education
Montana State University

Dale Lambert
Teacher
Eastmont School District (Washington)

Joe McCracken
Superintendent
Lockwood Elementary District (Montana)

Zola McMurray
Business Woman
Lewiston, Idaho

G. Angela Nagengast
Teacher
Great Falls High School (Montana)

Edie Orner
Teacher
Corvallis School District (Oregon)

Barney C. Parker (Chairman)
Superintendent
Independent District of Boise (Idaho)

Rosa Salas Palomo
Director of Education
Guam Department of Education

Fred Pomeroy
Superintendent
Kenai Peninsula Borough Schools (Alaska)

Dennis Ray
Superintendent
Walla Walla School District (Washington)

Doris Ray
Fairbanks School Board (Alaska)

Henry Sablan
Superintendent of Education
Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands

Tauese Sunia
Director of Education
Government of American Samoa

Charles Toguchi
Superintendent
Hawaii Department of Education

Doyle E. Winter (Vice Chairman)
Superintendent
Educational Service District 121
Seattle, Washington

Center for the Advancement of Pacific Education
1164 Bishop Street, Suite 1409
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
(808) 533-1748
SOURCE: BDE961
FAX: (808) 523-1741

NWREL Headquarters
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 275-9500
SOURCE: STL058
FAX: (503) 275-9489

Alaska Office:
Goldstein Building, Room 506
130 Seward Street
Juneau, Alaska 99801
(907) 586-4952